

The Case For Irish Independence

REV. JAMES J. HOWARD.

An Address Delivered at Worcester, Mass., April 6, 1919.

ON every question such as the one that brings us together tonight, the position of the United States has been fixed for many a year. As long ago as the early years of the last century, the question arose and it was settled then once for all. One of the oldest peoples in history was at that time engaged in a struggle to throw off the yoke of oppression. Nowhere was the contest watched with more interest or followed with more sympathy than here in our own country. After years of struggle, the affair had proceeded to the point that the Greeks had managed to assemble a sort of Parliament. In December of 1823, a member of Congress from Massachusetts, Daniel Webster by name, introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives that an agent or commissioner should be provided by this country to represent them at the Greek Assembly in whom the executive authority of the new State still rested. Taking the floor to speak on his own resolution, he said: "What part it behooves this country to take on a question of this sort cannot be doubtful. Our side of this question is settled for us even without our own volition. Our history, our character necessarily decide for us our position. Our place is on the side of free institutions."

Again the same question confronts our country. Ireland has declared her independence and organized her Parliament. The oldest nation in Christendom has shaken off the shackles that seven centuries could not make light, and sends a demand to the civilized nations that her action be recognized as valid, and appeals for a welcome from the other free nations. And every man who has caught the spirit of America knows by an instinct of national consciousness where he belongs. In the words of Webster, "Our place is on the side of free institutions."

But the case of Ireland does not rest here. The United States should give a welcome to independent Ireland and extend to her our good-will, not simply because it is

proper that we should hail the accession of another nation to the ranks of self-governing communities, a position in which we were pioneers, but she demands recognition as the fulfilment of something that looks very much like a contract; a contract openly published and freely accepted by the nations of the world.

When the United States declared war against Germany in 1917, and took her place on the battle-fields of Europe, it was in no way a continuation of the war that was going on and had been going on in Europe between Germany and the Allied nations. It was a new war entirely. With the causes and the purposes of the war that had been going on from August, 1914, to April, 1917, we had no national concern. Our officials had so declared on numerous occasions. We had been through a presidential election in which this very question was the issue more than all else: Do we belong in the European war? An overwhelming majority of the electorate and a sufficient majority of the Electoral College had decided in the negative. But in April, 1917, the situation had been changed. So many aggressions had been made upon us and so deeply was our own sovereignty threatened, that we felt that war with Germany was necessary as the only possible answer to the attacks to which we had been subjected. So far is it from the truth that we took on Europe's war, that the very opposite is the truth. We started a war of our own, for causes that satisfied our sense of justice and to attain purposes that were intimately wrapped up in the very genius of our institutions. The Allied nations then accepted our aims and purposes as the aims and purposes for which they would continue their war against Germany.

WHY WE FOUGHT

We were fortunate at the time in having at the head of our affairs a man whose capacity for clear thinking, whose keenness in close reasoning, whose happy facility in exact expression made him an ideal leader in working out the ends to be attained. Thanks to these qualities, the air was cleared instantly. He knew with Webster that our place was on the side of free institutions. In his speech to Congress asking for a declaration of war,

he very carefully distinguished between the causes whose gravity made war necessary and the ends that we should hope to attain by our participation in it. He submitted the following as the purposes of the United States: "We shall fight for the things that we have always carried nearest to our hearts: for democracy; for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their government; for the rights and liberties of small nations." Later he amplified these statements. He said, "We are fighting for the liberty, the self-government and the undictated development of all nations." A little later he insisted on the same thought: "We are fighting for the settlement of every political relationship on the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people concerned, and not on the basis of the advantage of any other people." The purposes thus expressed by our President became the purposes of the citizens of the United States. The public press spread them amongst our people and never was there a protest. In the halls of Congress they were accepted as the fundamental reasons for our action and never once were they contradicted or disavowed.

But the words did not stop at the water's edge. The hopes that spring from words such as those are too deeply imbedded in the heart of humanity to be confined to any one people. Instantly the oppressed of all races and all climes looked up; they began to see the dawn of the day when the burden would be lifted from their weary backs. So urgent did the longings of the oppressed become, so insistent was their cry to the God of Justice, that the toryism of centuries was swept aside and leaders of all the nations at war with the Germanic Powers announced their acceptance of these same purposes and their adhesion to these same ends as the purposes and ends for which they would continue to make war on Germany. We are only concerned with one of them for the moment. All men know that Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Balfour, the two men who had authority to voice the purposes of Great Britain, gave their solemn adhesion to the aims that had been announced by President Wilson. From that day on there was what amounted to a regularly executed contract to bring about the accomplishment of the

purposes expressed in the words of our President. It was no mere American form between the Government of the United States and her citizens, but it was re-inforced by the action of England so that the United States and England mutually agreed that the war would be for the "rights and liberties of small nations," "for the undictated development of all peoples," for the "settlement of every question of political relationship on the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people concerned and not on the basis of the advantage of any other people."

FOR FREE INSTITUTIONS

Then the whole aspect of the war changed instantly. It was not the old war. It was a new war. All hesitation in any group disappeared; all doubt in any mind was dissipated. We like to go over again and again in our thoughts the waves of emotion that swept over our people. We like to feel again the heart thrills that stirred the very fibers of their souls. We were not at war that any European nation might work out its sordid ends. We were where we belonged; where the fathers said we ought to be. "Our place is on the side of free institutions"; and we were waging war that the domain of free institutions might be broadened. Our men rushed to the colors in droves. From every walk of life they came, from field and factory, from profession and avocation, from the bench and the Church. Men of our race were there, not by the thousand but by the hundreds of thousands, eager for the sacrifice. They were bewitched by the thought of Ireland. The dying cry of Sarsfield on Landen's plain was ever ringing in the ears of every man of Irish blood: "Oh, that it had been for Ireland!" Now at last their blood would flow not alone for the glory of their own country in grateful thanks for the opportunities and liberty it had given them, but also that the homeland of their own race might again be a free nation. To the long list of names associated with the glories of our soldier race, they have added others just as glorious. No need to call them off before you, for your sons and brothers were at Seichprey, Château Thierry, St. Mihiel, the Argonne and the Meuse. Urged

on by the battle cry of Brian Boru on the plain of Clontarf nearly a thousand years ago, "Retreat does not become the men of our race," their onrush became so irresistible that in four months from the time that our troops definitely took their place in the battle-line, the German power crumbled and they sued for peace.

Then was forged another link in the contract. President Wilson, after the Allies had accepted our aims, had made a recapitulation of the war aims of all the nations opposed to Germany, which were embraced in the well-known fourteen points. His previous declarations in regard to the "undictated development of all people," and "the settlement of every political relationship on the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people concerned and not on the basis of their acceptance by any other people" formed the very core, the soul even of his fourteen points. He asked if Germany accepted them as final and beyond all discussion. They replied that they were so accepted, were not to be debated but were to be the foundation upon which peace terms were to rest. He asked, therefore, the nations that were fighting on our side if they were ready to make peace on those terms. They assented. The armistice was signed and put in effect. Now we had a contract not only between the nations fighting with us and their people, but a contract, to which even the Teutonic Powers had agreed, that there was to be undictated development of all peoples.

From the very depths of the abyss where the oppressed lay buried beneath the accumulated outrages of ages, a great shout of triumph broke forth that echoed and re-echoed around the world. The Pole heard it, organized his government and was welcomed. Across the plains of Europe the triumphant shout was wafted and the Czecho-Slav and the Jugo-Slav heard it, organized their governments and were welcomed. On it still rolled, even into the hearts of sleeping Asia. The Armenian, the Syrian, even the Arabian heard it, and they are welcomed. Another ancient people in their island home in the Atlantic heard it. Using the proper legal channels, they selected their representatives, they organized a government and asked for recognition—and instead of welcome, the Irish people are told to wait.

Contracts are not to be trifled with. They are the cornerstone of civilization. They lie at the very root of social order. So sacred are they that the forty-eight States composing this Union have bound themselves explicitly to pass no law that could vitiate a contract. When men break a contract they are very careful to advance the reasons that justify their action. Nations are but aggregates of individuals, and there is such a thing as a national conscience as well as an individual conscience. Now that one of the nations is trying to break her contract with Ireland, her people and her defenders are also alleging reasons and excuses. These excuses may all be summed up in the general statement: Ireland is a domestic question that concerns only the internal affairs of England and does not come within the terms of the agreement.

This plea in opposition must be examined. It rests upon two assumptions both of which are false. To make that plea valid, they must show that nations do not intervene in the domestic affairs of other nations and that Ireland is not in fact a separate and distinct nation. If we can show that Ireland is a separate nation, then their answer does not apply, for it is not an internal question of England. If we can show that nations do interfere with the other nations' internal affairs, then the bottom drops out of their contention and their disclaimer cannot be allowed.

WE HAVE INTERVENED BEFORE

Do we ever intervene in the internal affairs of other nations? What did we do in 1913 when we told the Mexicans that the character of their President was such that until he was eliminated we could have nothing to do with them? In 1903, a rebellion broke out in one of the States of the United States of Colombia. The maintaining of its sovereignty over every part of its territory is certainly an internal question to every nation. Yet we landed marines and had naval forces there to prevent Colombia from restoring her authority on her own soil. In 1898 we told Spain that she must get out of Cuba, and because she would not do it as quickly as we wanted, we waged war against her to drive her from the West Indies. Yet Spain had discovered, settled and governed Cuba for 400 years and her government in the

island was in no way our affair, and by the principles that these men allege, we had no right to intervene in the question. As a matter of fact, some of those who are shouting the loudest that Ireland is an internal affair, concerning only England, were shrieking at the top of their voices that we were right in 1913, 1903 and 1898. What is our famous Monroe Doctrine, about which we are so solicitous, but an interference not alone with one nation but with a whole set of nations? The right of nations over their own soil would seem to be a purely domestic question, and yet we tell South America and the States of the world that if those countries yield a foothold to any European country or Asiatic country that we will wage war to prevent it, both against the country that yields and the country that tries to acquire such a foothold. That is a pure case of intervening in the internal affairs of other nations, if there is such a thing anywhere.

Does England ever interfere in the internal affairs of other nations? Because the South African Republics would not permit outsiders, principally Englishmen, to vote and be a full part of their governments without having renounced their previous allegiance, England wiped them off the map, and surely the extent of suffrage to be enjoyed by aliens is a domestic question. In 1881 the Egyptians, an independent people, were not paying their bills as the English thought they should, and their cities were bombarded and their country was overrun, and England has never left it since that day. But we need not go so far. We built and owned the Panama Canal. The coasting trade, by law, with us can only be undertaken by vessels flying the American flag. We passed a law that such trade which by law is confined to domestic shipping might pass the Canal toll-free. It was our domestic question. It infringed no right of any other power. Yet England made us repeal the Toll act. And yet there are those who say that a nation cannot intervene in any domestic question of another power. This so-called principle is evidently merely a catch phrase.

IRELAND A NATION

But whether nations intervene or not makes but little difference in this case, for Ireland is a separate and dis-

tinct nation. Even in English law the crown of the Kingdom of Ireland is merely annexed to, and not united with, the crown of the Kingdom of England, as is the case with Scotland. The Parliament of England recognizes the same fact, and laws made by that Parliament only affect Ireland when the law so states expressly. Even the legal title of their country, the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, gives testimony to the same fact. Ireland suffered much in the last 750 years from the English connection, but she should now be spared this crowning infamy of being deprived of her title to nationhood. Ireland is a nation whose boundaries were set by the almighty finger of the most high God. Ireland is a nation whose people are ethnically of purer stock than any people in Europe. Ireland is a nation that had a culture and civilization of her own when the Angles and the Normans were savages in their forests. Ireland is a nation whose sons have carried civilization and Christianity to England, Scotland, France and Germany, even to parts of Italy. If all these things—a fixed territory, her own culture and civilization, a pure race whose sons have served well the cause of civilization—if all these things together do not make a nation, then may we ask what claim has any people in the world to the title of nationhood?

But all men know that Ireland is a nation, and now four-fifths of the Irish people have united in one purpose, and that purpose is sustained by the millions of men of Irish blood scattered throughout the world. With a properly and duly organized government, she presents herself to the nations of the world and asks that her act of declaring her independence be ratified, that her independence be recognized, and that she be accepted as a sister in the family of nations. And who will dare to say her nay? Surely, not our country. Our place is on the side of free institutions. Surely we are not going to turn our back on our whole history. We welcomed the South American Republics as they emerged one by one into political independence. We welcomed France as a Republic when she shook off the Bourbons. We welcomed Greece when she shook off the abominations of the Turk. We sympathized with the Hungarian in '48 and the Pole

in '63, and only awaited the organization of a government to recognize them. We told Spain that she must efface herself in the West Indies because her type of government there had become a nuisance, and we organized and recognized the Republic of Cuba. Surely, then, let other nations do what they will, we can never refuse recognition to Ireland without stultifying ourselves.

But even if we should forget our history and our contract, even though every Irish lip were sealed, the dead must be reckoned with. That thought must give us pause. Even though all others become silent, the dead would struggle till they found a voice. We know that in tones that would circle the earth like the peal of the thunder, the dead would cry out: "You led us to the sacrifice under a banner upon which you had written, 'We fight for the liberty of small nations,' and while we lived no man dared insult that banner much less tear it down. Now that we have died beneath it, will you drag it down in the dirt and see it bedraggled with the slime of hypocrisy?" The voice of the dead only gives assurance to the determination of the living.

Acting through the proper legal channels, Ireland has declared her independence. Her right to self-determination was won for her on the battle-fields of Europe. She has used her rights. She now asks us to recognize her as an independent nation. Our course has been decided for us long ago. We have no option in the matter. We must acknowledge the validity of her act, for "Our place is on the side of free institutions."

Ireland's Present Position

ERSKINE CHILDERS.

IRELAND is coming to occupy a strange position in the world; the most hopeful or the most hopeless, according to our estimate of tendencies. In the midst of the eternal conflict between right and might she stands a lonely, symbolic figure, tragically isolated, and yet the prize of contending principles, seemingly so sharply defined that the issue cannot be deferred.

Here is a country governed at this moment, like Belgium under Prussia, by a nation which went to war to free Belgium from Prussia. For Belgium was then the symbol of right, and the defense of right against might was the declared aim of the enemies of Germany. The evil thing fought against was described in many formulae—"Militarism," "Prussianism," and the rest—which all meant the same thing—the selfish use of national force by the strong against the weak.

The aim was to defeat this evil, to protect the weak against the strong and to preserve the "freedom of small nationalities." Whatever other unexpressed purposes there may have been, this was the aim declared to the world, and by none more solemnly than Great Britain. It was even urged upon Ireland as a reason for her enthusiastic participation in the war, although, with incredible blindness to the facts of human nature, the war itself was made an excuse for postponing Ireland's own freedom, and her consequent coldness was used to blacken her in the eyes of the world as a friend of "Prussianism."

The declared aim of the war was sustained and strengthened by events. With the fall of the Czar and the intervention of America two fresh formulae appeared—"democracy" and "self-determination." These were not new aims, but obvious extensions and corollaries of the original one, with the main stress laid on the emancipation of subject States instead of on the restoration of States free before the war, like Belgium and Serbia.

Democratic self-determination as a universal principle of human right was the sustained burden of all the brilliant and ardent propaganda of President Wilson. He addressed the whole world, Allies and enemies alike. "Our message is to all imperialists," he once said. And it was also to all subject nationalities, without distinction of race, color, religion or strategical situation. "We are fighting for the liberty, the self-government, and undictated development of all peoples." (May 26, 1917.) "What we seek is the reign of law based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind." (July 4, 1918.)

The same universal principle was proclaimed in the speech to Congress (January 8, 1918), containing the famous fourteen points, which afterwards became the

official basis of peace. "An evident principle," he concluded, "runs through the whole program I have outlined. It is the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak."

The points themselves, embodying terms of peace with the enemy, had to deal mainly with the direct issues of the war. Regarded in this light, some of them lack exact precision, but their spirit is unmistakable. They prescribe free self-development for nationalities great and small.

COMMITTED TO WILSON'S PRINCIPLES

In repeatedly giving application to his charter of freedom for the weak, it would be idle to pretend that the President had had the outspoken concurrence of his European allies, who were themselves rulers of subject peoples on a vaster scale than the enemy Powers. But in their final acceptance of "the terms of peace laid down in the President's address to Congress of January, 1918, and the principles of settlement enunciated in his subsequent addresses," they definitely and in honor committed themselves not only to the fourteen points (with one exception), but to the "evident principle" underlying them.

Great Britain was especially committed both by the warm praise given to all the President's utterances and by the Prime Minister's speeches at the same period, embodying, according to general agreement, an identical policy with that of the United States. But whatever the inner views of the imperialists, events forced the issue. The disintegration of the Russian Empire left a dozen small nationalities without a master.

Nine months later the collapse in quick succession of the Turkish, Austrian and German Empires added a host more. All Europe and much of Asia was in a ferment of republicanism, and "self-determination" was not only the universal inspiration but the deciding factor in reconstruction. It was impossible to expect that reconstruction should be easy, that this gigantic ferment should subside at once on what Mr. Wilson called "clearly recognized lines of nationality."

There are complexities still unsolved and perils that

cannot be avoided arising from the intermixture and interpenetration of races and languages and the absence of clearly defined frontiers. There are perils arising from mutilations and temporary annexations of parts of Germany itself and from claims like that of Italy over Jugoslavia. The future of some of the Asiatic races is still undecided. But this much is true, that the ancient servitudes are gone forever, and that Europe, at any rate, now consists of free peoples, with the one solitary exception of Ireland.

But that is not the full extent of the anomaly. White peoples in the rest of the world, all of them offshoots of Great Britain, had already made good their right to self-determination, so that Ireland survives as the only white community on the face of the globe where the "government by consent," which President Wilson summoned the "organized opinion of mankind" to sustain, is not established.

If in Ireland special circumstances could be shown to exist which distinguish her case from all others, it would still be hardly possible to justify an anomaly so flagrant. But there are none. On the contrary, her case is simpler than that of any of the host of new European nationalities. She is an island, with the best and most immutable of all frontiers, the sea, with an historical identity beyond dispute and an historical unity beyond dispute, for, although conquered and to some extent colonized, she has absorbed conquerors and colonists, so that all her inhabitants call themselves Irishmen, live under an Irish administration, and obey laws common to the whole island, but differing widely from those of Great Britain.

And among these Irishmen, Ulstermen included, there is a larger measure of unanimity for unified self-government and a smaller and less difficult minority problem than in any of the new European States, while minority problems at least as difficult were surmounted in the great dominions. Nor does freedom for Ireland raise any ulterior international problems and difficulties like those which, in default of the most unselfish and enlightened statesmanship, threaten the new Europe.

Ireland has no irredenta: she covets nothing, threatens nobody and arouses no rival cupidities. She is as incapable of aggression as she is incapable of defense

against the one Power she has ever had to deal with, Great Britain, and this Power is the strongest in the world.

The only danger lies in not satisfying her claim. The refusal to do so poisons the relations of the English-speaking races and makes a constant bar to their closer union. It is possible to imagine a more conspicuously simple and urgent case for conceding "liberty, self-government, and undictated development," and for sustaining them by the "organized opinion of mankind"—in other words, by a true League of Nations.

Can any League of Nations framed, in the words of the fourteen points, expressly "to afford mutual guarantees of political and territorial independence for small States," be other than an imposture as long as its most powerful member refuses that concession? So much for the Irish claim.

A CANDID IMPERIALIST'S VIEW

Let us put the reply into the mouth of a candid imperialist cynic: "We fought against 'militarism.' Of course, but not against our own. All the Allied empires rest on force, and it would have been excessively ridiculous, as you seem to be partly aware, to make their dissolution an object of the war against Germany. White races or colored, it makes no matter. How could we have fought on the side of Russia against 'militarism'?"

"We fought against Prussia—Germany—a tremendous commercial and military power emerging from an interior position in Europe to dispute with us the empire of the East and the markets of the world. We honestly fought, too, against the German brand of militarism, a brand which discredited (in Belgium and elsewhere) a principle honorable and legitimate in itself.

"We had to represent to the Irish that the Belgian case was typical, and that by standing out of the war they sympathized with rape, burnings, etc. They, of course, contesting, as they always do, the necessary militarism we exercise over them, saw the matter in another light and wanted Home Rule first as a pledge of good faith.

"Luckily, Redmond was a chivalrous statesman. There was a moment of agonizing suspense (I was in the House and felt it) when he offered Irish help. Would

he demand the condition precedent, firmly and squarely? I had a horrifying vision of the Irish flocking to the transports under the Union Jack (green flags in their haversacks), with the Ulstermen, under some weird emblem, ravaging their homes in the rear. But the danger passed.

"To be frank, there was the same sort of embarrassment in all our propaganda. We had to stress the note of liberty beyond its real value and paint atrocities in very high colors, because we had to stimulate the proletariats and convert America to enlightened militarism, while disgusting her with the discreditable side of it.

"But meanwhile the rational aims of the war were pursued in the dignified secrecy of the Allied Councils. Fresh allies had to be obtained, their price paid, and arrangements made for a fair division of the ultimate spoils, territorial and economic. You yourself can hardly suppose that we fought for the *beaux yeux* of the Croats and Poles *et hoc genus omne*. The Croats and several other interesting nationalities whose names I forget were delivered to Italy in April, 1915, while we were still talking to Ireland about the freedom of small nationalities, and the Poles were handed over, body and soul, to Russia, rightly enough, in the secret treaty of February, 1917.

"It was fortunate that these and all the other arrangements were successfully kept secret for so long. They would have hampered especially the anti-Irish propaganda which we were forced by their own insane behavior to keep up. It would, for example, have been more difficult than it was to explain the burning of a portion of Dublin and the execution of a dozen ringleaders in the pathetically foolish rebellion of 1916 if the secret treaty signed in the same month, partitioning the Turkish subject nationalities, had been generally known. Luckily, the Liberals were still in power.

"Now I come to the ardent Mr. Wilson, the enlarged formulas, and our supposed adherence to his universal principles. Here I join issue squarely. We were not committed to his crazy excesses of idealism. Would he come in? That was the point. And when he did at last come in, so far as anyone knows to the contrary, he made no conditions. He could have tried to stipulate for a free Ireland or a free Togoland or anything he pleased,

but he did not do so, and probably he could not have done so, because his own people, hot for war, and responding admirably to our anti-Irish propaganda, had developed a very robust militarism which was out simply to thrash the Germans and avenge Belgium. Besides, there were the Philippines. We ourselves were out to win the war. Do not you perceive that we should have lost the war—worse than lost it—if we had subscribed to the universal principles?

"Let me point, too, that Mr. Wilson himself was shaky. On December 4, 1917, in declaring for war upon Austria-Hungary, he expressly disclaimed any 'wish to impair or rearrange the Austro-Hungarian Empire' (an empire which was a congeries of rebellious little nationalities). He retracted this a month later in the 'fourteen-points' speech, but in the interval the Bolsheviks had invited all the Powers at war to discuss peace at Brest on the basis of 'no annexations and self-determination,' two words which summed up all his ardent orations.

"He was silent, like the rest of us. A lucid interval. Occasionally, you see, somebody explained to him some of the racial facts of Europe, of which he was quite ignorant. But he always returned to the clouds and he came only half-way down to construct the fourteen points.

"No doubt the speech containing them was aimed against the enemy. The condemnation of 'secret covenants' and 'conquest and aggrandizement' shows it, independently of the passages you quoted, but we really agreed only to the points themselves—and what a medley they are of obvious platitudes, grandiloquent ambiguities and Utopian impossibilities!

SIX POINTS DISAPPEARED.

"The first six points have disappeared (virtually), and note that the sixth guarantees Russia 'unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for independent determination of her own political development . . . under institutions of her own choosing.' This is described as an 'acid test,' and it is one with a vengeance, for if we can assert our right (and we have asserted it) to impose institutions on Russia, *a fortiori*, we can maintain institutions in Ireland.

"The fifth point, under much ardent verbiage, settles the 'colonial claims' in our favor. 'The interests of the populations are to have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.' Equal, mind you, and it is the titles, not the institutions, which are to be determined. That is sane imperialism. Ireland is in all but the name a colony. The tenth point, assuring to the old subject nationalities of Turkey 'absolutely unmolested opportunity for autonomous development,' is, of course, absurd. The happy expedient of mandates will solve this and other questions for the imperial races.

"Lastly, the fourteenth point. Well, I perceived from what you said that you are under no illusions. We had to quiet Mr. Wilson with a league. It will not live very long, but as long as it lives it is a buttress of 'imperialism.' The preamble, lengthy as it is, does not hint at 'liberty.' The implications were anathema. The Great Powers are the masters and are confirmed in their mastery, all save the effete, which discredit a great principle and disappear, and Germany has to be crushed.

"The League sanctions conquest; that is the main thing; the mandate system is immaterial. If any phrase had even hinted that a country lost in war by the Power owning it were *ipso facto* to be free, the pass would have been sold and the door opened to disintegration and anarchy. For the rest, Ireland's very existence is ignored by the league. Ireland, for the league's purpose, is England. That is right.

"We would have much preferred to see a strong imperialistic Russia planted at Constantinople, as arranged in the secret treaty of March, 1915, and we had no real quarrel with Austria-Hungary. All we can do, as matters have fallen out, is to manipulate the mushroom States in such a way as to create the greatest possible obstacle to German expansion eastward and Bolshevik penetration westward.

"Yes, Ireland alone is left, the last white subject community in the world (broadly, speaking, as you say), a ten times more deserving and less dangerous recipient of the blessings of freedom than these inextricably confused and half-civilized communities, with their depressing and

unpronounceable names. I do not want to talk the conventional Unionist nonsense about Ireland. I make you a present of the rest of your case. Given your line of reasoning, which is wrong, it is unanswerable. But do not you see that, on our line of reasoning, which is right, all your arguments make up an equally unanswerable case for keeping Ireland?

"White or colored matters not a whit now. Egypt, India and scores of other nationalities are watching Ireland. 'Self-determination' has superseded Home-Rule. If we willingly (that is the point) give up a country which we possess, and which we can easily keep (three divisions—what is that?) merely because seventy-five per cent. of its inhabitants clamor for us to do so, we set a disastrous and irrevocable precedent for ourselves and we betray our allies.

"The Dominion precedent? If you read intelligently, you know that we did not spontaneously give liberty to the dominions in a holy passion for justice. They were either troublesome or threatening to become so, and we did not think it worth while to face the risk and nuisance of another American war. In effect their own Sinn Fein won liberty for them. But we cannot by our own willing consent allow Sinn Fein to win liberty for Ireland. That would be suicide. I am sorry for what goes on there . . . but they will come to reason. We have strong friends in the country, and we mean it well."

Ireland's Policy

PRESIDENT DE VALERA.

OUR first duty as the elected Government of the Irish people will be to make clear to the world the position in which Ireland now stands. There is in Ireland at this moment only one lawful authority, and that authority is the elected Government of the Irish Republic. Of the other power claiming authority we can say, adapting the words of Cardinal Mercier:

The authority of that power is no lawful authority. Therefore in soul and conscience the Irish people owe that authority neither respect, nor attachment, nor obedience. The

sole authority in this country is the authority of our own Government, the authority of the elected representatives of the Irish nation. This authority alone has the right to our affection and to our submission. * * * The acts of the usurper have in themselves no authority, and such of those acts as affect the general interests and to which we may give ratification, will have authority only in virtue of such ratification which alone gives them judicial value.

Toward the persons of those who hold dominion among us by military force we shall conduct ourselves with all needful forbearance. We shall observe the rules they have laid upon us so long as those rules do not violate our personal liberty, nor our consciences, nor our duty to our country.

Our attitude toward the powers that maintain themselves here against the expressed will of the people shall then, in a word, be this: We shall conduct ourselves toward them in such a way as will make it clear to the world that we acknowledge no right of theirs. Such use of their laws as we shall make will be dictated solely by necessity and only in so far as we deem them for the public good.

In order to secure for our people our *de jure* Government, and for the Irish Republic which the Irish people have willed to set up, the necessary international recognition, we shall send at once our accredited representatives to Paris to the Peace Conference and to the League of Nations. We shall give them all necessary authority, and that they may proceed there in a manner befitting their character as the representatives of a nation, we shall apply for the necessary safe-conduct to enable them to pass through the naval and military cordons with which the power in occupation of our country has surrounded us.

We shall send also to other countries a number of duly credited Ambassadors and Consuls to see that the position of Ireland is understood, as it truly is, and not as English propaganda would represent it, and in general to see that the interests of Ireland in these countries are in no way neglected. We shall thus resume that intercourse with other peoples which it has been the chief aim of English statecraft to cut off, and which, indeed, English power has succeeded in cutting off for over a century.

At the present time of general world-reconstruction it is most important that the material interests of the country at home be also looked after, and by Irishmen. It will be the duty of our Ministry to secure the co-operation and to co-ordinate the activities of the various bodies which

have taken voluntarily on themselves the safeguarding and advancement of those interests. Toward English legislation interfering with these interests we shall act in accordance with the general principles I have already indicated, that is, we shall act as we think best for the general good.

To measures such as the English Ways and Communications bill, designed, as regards Ireland, to prevent Irishmen from using the national resources of their own country, to benefit their own nation, handing over on set purpose to an English bureau complete control of the communications of this country so that they may be used solely in the interests of England—to such measures we shall offer all the resistance we can command as being both injurious and unjust. It will be the special duty of our Director of Trade to examine, in co-operation with public bodies, how best to make our resistance effective.

The Ministers and Directors at the heads of other departments—Labor, Industries, Agriculture, Local Government—will similarly be charged with seeking co-operation with all interested in their departments. The Minister for National Defense is, of course, in close association with the voluntary military forces which are the foundation of the National Army.

It is obvious that the work of our Government cannot be carried on without funds. The Minister of Finance is accordingly preparing a prospectus, which will shortly be published, for the issue of a loan of £1,000,000 sterling—£500,000 to be offered to the public for immediate subscription, £250,000 at home and £250,000 abroad, in bonds of such amounts as to meet the needs of the small subscriber.

Comparative Age of the Catholic Church and of the Sects

NAME: Catholic Church, Place of Origin: Jerusalem, Founder: Jesus Christ, A. D., Year: 33; Lutheran, Germany, Martin Luther, 1517; Anabaptists, Germany, Nicholas Stork, 1521; Calvinists (they are known as Presbyterians in Scotland and America; Reformed

in Holland; Puritans in England; Congregationalists in America), Switzerland, John Calvin, 1534; Episcopalians, England, Henry VIII, 1534; Unitarian Congregationalists, Germany, Celarius, about 1540; Presbyterian (Old School), Scotland, General Assembly, 1560; Congregationalists, England, Robert Browne, 1538; Baptists, Rhode Island, Roger Williams, 1639; Quakers, England, George Fox, 1647; Quakers, America, William Penn, 1681; Methodist Episcopal, England, John Wesley, 1739; Free-Will Baptists, New Hampshire, Benj. Randall, 1780; Free Communion Baptists, New York, B'jah Corp., close 18th century; Disciples, or Christians, Virginia, Alex Campbell, 1813; Reformed Methodist, Vermont, Branch of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1814; Methodist Society, New York, branch of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1920; Methodist Protestant, Baltimore, branch of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1830; Adventist, United States, William Miller, 1831; Seven-Day Baptists, United States, General Conference, 1833; Presbyterian (New School), Philadelphia, General Assembly, 1840; True Western Methodist, New York, Delegates from Methodist Denominations, 1843; Seventh-Day Adventists, Battle Creek, Mich., Mrs. E. G. White, 1884; Spiritualist, Hydesville, N. Y., Fox Family, 1848; Christian Scientists, Boston, Mass., Mrs. Mary B. Eddy, 1879; they were re-organized, Boston, Mass., Mrs. Mary B. Eddy, 1892.

The Catholic Church was founded by Our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, in Jerusalem in the year 33. The Catholic Church traces its ancestry back to the days of Christ and His Apostles. No non-Catholic denomination can go back further than the sixteenth century, that is, not more than 400 years. The Catholic Church is the oldest Christian institution in the world. It has seen the birth of all the governments, and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist both in Europe and America. The blood of her martyrs and her missionaries had bathed the soil of every part of the world fifteen hundred years before the first Protestant religion was started by Martin Luther, about 1517.